



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,436	08/29/2005	Peter Hubertus Lamers	94018	2554
7590 02/24/2010				
Welsh & Katz 120 South Riverside Plaza 22nd Floor Chicago, IL 60606-3913			EXAMINER CHANG, VICTOR S	
			ART UNIT 1794	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/24/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

NOTE

1. The after Final amendment to the specification filed 2/8/2010 to state “The free volume in the web may be 40% to 80%, preferably 60% to 70%” has been entered. Applicants corrected pointed out that support can be found in claim 10 of original filing.
2. Applicants argue that the limitation “a free volume of more than 60%”, added in a previous amendment filed 9/21/2009, is supported by the amended specification as set forth above. However, the free volume recitation in claim 1 is not directed to the **web**, rather the limitation recites “said **foam-structure** having a free volume of more than 60%”. Further, even if the intended structure is web, the added limitation lacks upper limit, and is therefore broader than the provided support. As such, the new matter rejection under 112, 1st paragraph is maintained.
3. Applicants argue at Remarks page 3:

“the only disclosure in Cox is in the claims wherein claim 2 represents the free volume of the web is less than 60% and claim 7 represents that the free volume in the web is at most 60%. This is a teaching by Cox away from Applicant's disclosure of free volume being 60 to 70% and as claimed “more than 60%” and, in addition is a teaching that is not enabled by Cox, as it is not discussed in the specification. As a result Applicant believes that the claims currently on file should be patentable.”

However, as set forth above, applicants’ argument is misdirected to the **web**, whereas the recited limitation clearly relates to the **foam structure**. Further, even if the free volume of web is considered, while Cox teaches that the free volume available to resin filling is less than 60%, Cox also teaches that the remaining free volume is occupied by the foam structure. See paragraph [0015]. In other words, the total free volume of Cox’s web is greater than 60%.

Application/Control Number: 10/529,436

Page 3

Art Unit: 1794

/Victor S Chang/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794